



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,875	09/18/2001	Muditha Pradeep Dantanarayana	P 281479	1264
23117	7590	07/21/2008	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC			MENDOZA, MICHAEL G	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR				
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3734	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/868,875	DANTANARAYANA, MUDITHA PRADEEP	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	MICHAEL G. MENDOZA	3734	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –


(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9, 10, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Miller 5272285.

3. Miller teaches an apparatus including: a relatively rigid external housing (col. 2, lines 61-62); at least one noise producing component, the at least one noise producing component including an electric motor blower (compressors are known to be run by electricity to power a motor producing air) and at least one muffler (the reduced size of inlet and outlet [32 & 35] would lessen the sound of rushing air entering or exiting the inlet or outlet); a thin flexible enclosure (col. 2, lines 63-64, the enclosure forms a bag when closed) substantially sealed around each noise producing component; wherein the flexible enclosure is produced from plastic material (col. 3, lines 37-40); wherein the flexible enclosure includes an opening; and wherein the opening is sealable by adhesive tape; wherein the flexible enclosure includes one or more apertures; and wherein the noise producing component further includes a second muffler, and fire muffler defining an inlet muffler and the second muffler defines an outlet muffler.

4. As to claims 9, the recitation is for supplying breathable gas has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is

generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).



#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 8, and 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller.
7. As to claims 3, 12, and 20, Miller discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the plastic material is Cosmoothene F221-1 or polyethylene. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed limitations, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to the plastic materials claimed because Miller teaches an conventional plastic material can be used (col. 3, lines 37-40).
8. As to claims 8, 11 and 13-17, Miller teaches the claimed invention, however does not specifically disclose a wiring aperture. Miller teaches a compressor. Compressors are well known to be powered by electricity supplied by an electrical cord. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to supply the plastic enclosure of Miller with some type of hole or aperture to allow a power cord to supply power to the device within the enclosure.
9. As to claims 18, 19, 23, 25 and 26, Miller teaches all the limitations as indicated in the above rejections. Miller teaches the claimed invention except for the enclosure being substantially independent of the external housing. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the enclosure substantially independent, since it has been held that constructing a formerly

integral structure in various elements involves only routine skill in the art. *Nerwin v. Erlichman*, 168 USPQ 177, 179.

10. As to claims 21 and 22, Miller fails to teach the claimed shape of the enclosure. However, it would have been obvious to used the claimed shape limitations because the shape of the enclosure is a mere design choice and that any shape would perform equally well. Furthermore, the Applicant has not disclosed that the specific type of shape solves any state problems or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the shape taught by Miller.

11. As to claims 24, Miller teaches the apparatus as claimed in claim 18. It should be noted that Miller fails to specifically teach pressurized gas in the range of 4-20 cm H<sub>2</sub>O. However, it is well known in the art of compressors that the pressure of air exiting the compressor is adjustable including within the claimed range.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL G. MENDOZA whose telephone number is (571)272-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Todd Manahan can be reached on (571) 272-4713. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. G. M./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3734

/Todd E Manahan/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3731